

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

June 20, 2006

6:00 PM

Chairman Osborne called the meeting to order.

The Clerk calls the roll.

Present: Aldermen Osborne, O'Neil, Shea, Roy, Long

Messrs.: R. MacKenzie, T. Arnold, J. Hoben, J. Plourde, Lt. Valenti,
T. White, B. Thomas, P. Borek

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Draft of a Wayfinding Signage Package for the City of Manchester
submitted by the Director of Planning and Community Development.

Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, stated the City has been looking at a more comprehensive way of getting people around the City, a more comprehensive sign package for several years now. The Chamber of Commerce has had several groups that have looked at this and felt that it was important for the City to do. We have put together, working with Jim Hoben at the Traffic Division and Bruce Thomas at the Highway Department, a Wayfinding Signage Package for the City. If I could just go through the four slides here, first the intent is to create a consistent wayfinding and identity system to really allow visitors and newcomers to find their way easily around the City. We know how to get around the City but a lot of people don't and good signage, clear signage, simple signage is important to do that. Secondly we wanted to try to reduce the amount of visual clutter. We have a lot of signs around the City. The more signs there are the fewer that people can really comprehend the important ones. This you can see going down in some retail areas where there are literally hundreds of signs and it is hard to pick out really what you are looking for. Third, we want to make people be able to find parking locations and pedestrian areas easily. The fourth one is also very important. We want to provide a positive image for the City. If you go to cities that have a good signage package, you go into those cities and it really gives the impression that they have their act together and it provides an indication that we are doing things right. The image is a really important part of a good signage package. Lastly, we wanted a sign system that could easily be maintained by the City through the Traffic Department working with Highway and that there would

be a logical system for ongoing administration. That was the hardest part of looking at this – coming up with guidelines because a lot of people will come to you and say I want my sign for my hot tub on the right-of-way. It is going to be hard for the Aldermen to decipher which ones should be allowed within the right-of-way and which ones shouldn't. We did spend some time and we will have guidelines in the package on what should be allowed. This is an example of some of the issues that we currently have. This is one of the major entrances to the City. You can see right here...does anybody know where this is? Can anybody picture where this location is? It is off Amoskeag Bridge coming up to Elm Street. Here we have about a dozen signs. You can see here this is more of a regulatory sign hiding another sign. We have 12 signs here, some of them hidden and some of them not visible. Here is the actual City sign for showing which way to go to different locations like Gill Stadium but the combination here is that it looks cluttered and kind of scattered and there is no real good way of picking out signs easily. All of the signs are different. So we are proposing a more consistent program. Four areas right near the highway are at highway exits. We would closely follow guidelines of the state highway and national. These are actually two alternatives we could look at. This is the more traditional alternative and this one is slightly different and we could even look at having logos on these but at the highway exits we are going to have signs that are very close to what you would see as a national standard and the state highway frankly is going to require that. We have met with state highway. They want to work with us. They recognize the difficulties because they face the same thing. A large mall wants to have a sign right on the highway so they have to deal with that all the time. This would be a major entrance point to the City right at the exit. As we get into the City we would have a series of signs. The top signs would be typically what we would see for vehicular signs so as you would be coming across the Amoskeag Bridge approaching Elm Street you might have a sign such as this on which way to go downtown, which way to parking, which way to colleges. These are just a couple of different variations of vehicular signs. We are trying to adopt a somewhat different philosophy. Given that so many people would want signage we are trying to get people more accustomed to the districts of the City. So if you have a few colleges in the Millyard and some high tech businesses we are going to try to focus signs on "this way to the Millyard" as opposed to "this way to Springfield College or Franklin Pierce College or UNHM." Hopefully they will identify more with the Millyard and then once you get onto Commercial Street you would have the more detailed signs like UNHM to your left, etc. So we are going to identify certain districts such as downtown, the Millyard, the West Side and maybe even in the future smaller neighborhoods from the Kelley Street area, South Willow Street retail...so again trying to identify districts as opposed to very specific users. The second tier here would be signs related to parking. In the downtown area in particular we would have directional signs like "this way to the Victory Parking Garage" and an identifying sign once you go there. Like "Welcome to the Victory

Garage” and then once you get out of the parking garage we would have small signage that would have a map of the downtown and how to get to certain places so that as you come right out of the parking facility you get some idea of where to go to on foot. Then in pedestrian areas...

Chairman Osborne interjected can I stop you. Can you go back to the other slide when you are coming out of the garage? These little signs that you have at the bottom are these going to be different businesses you are talking about?

Mr. MacKenzie stated again we are not...it is hard to draw the line between businesses and other uses. Once you put one business on it is hard to deny others.

Chairman Osborne responded I understand that. That is why I am asking.

Mr. MacKenzie stated these down here we would perceive as being “This way to City Hall” or “This way to the Verizon” or “This way to the Post Office” and other public features and non-profit features like the Palace Theatre.

Chairman Osborne asked so City and non-profits.

Mr. MacKenzie answered correct. Then once you get out onto Elm Street for example we would have smaller pedestrian signs so as you walk down Elm Street you would see a sign let's say at Hanover that says “This way to the Palace Theatre” or “This way” to a particular historic district or across the street to City Hall. Also in several other locations in the downtown we would have a directory. We would have a map like you would see in a mall but again these would be limited to public places and non-profit places. Finally we also have an interpretive signage package that will be coming in shortly. We got money from the federal government to design some interpretive historic signs in the Millyard. There are 10 locations that talk about the history of water power, how the mills were developed and we were funded because the Millyard area was designated as a cultural and scenic byway. By the way, this is Mena from our staff who has been working on the signage package. I think that is the last of our slides. We do have in the package a preliminary listing of the specific types of places that we should have on the signs. Again we are hoping that the Committee will be supportive of that approach. In small towns maybe you can have a listing of local businesses. We are a big city with hundreds or perhaps even thousands of businesses and hundreds of churches and at some point you have to make it more logical and bring people to you know South Willow Retail District as opposed to bringing them to the Mall of NH. We do hope to begin working on this if the Committee approves this. We hope to be working with the Traffic Division and the Highway Department through the summer. We do have funds to work on at least a pilot area, which we see as basically the central part of the City and part of the West

Side and if it is successful we would hope to bring this throughout the City so out to our major gateways such as Bridge Street, South Willow Street and places on the West Side. It will take some time to make sure that the signs are in the exact right location, that they represent the City well and that we don't have too much clutter so part of the attempt here is we will have to go out at some point and take down those signs that already exist as we showed on that particular photograph. At this point we would be happy to answer any questions of the Committee.

Chairman Osborne asked there are no City monies involved right now correct. This is the money you had set aside for a couple of years or so right?

Mr. MacKenzie answered right we had money set aside I think two years ago to work on this package. There is no new money required.

Chairman Osborne stated can I just ask you and maybe you don't know yet but these type of signs are not going to replace your "Here to Corner" signs or "20 minute parking" and all of these other signs right. You will find if you just talk a ride down Maple Street for instance at nighttime if you were to read every sign that was there you would be in one of the poles because you can't read them all. There are so many of them. We still have a lot of clutter out there outside of doing this. What you had shown up here I can see what you are saying. There are a whole bunch trying to direct people to one place or another but I think...I don't know if this is really going to clean up the City. We have a lot more to do besides this I guess.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes those are what I call regulatory signs like "No Parking" and each one of those is approved by this Committee. We are hoping to start with these directional signs and organize these but I do believe that at some time the Committee is going to have to work on those regulatory signs because we have a lot of them and they are everywhere.

Chairman Osborne asked how much do you think this would clean up – what you have that is out there right now. What is the percentage? 20% or 25%?

Mr. MacKenzie answered basically in the long-term this is going to take down all of the old directional signs to various places so this will clean up a lot of them but probably 80% of the signs we have along our streets are regulatory so it doesn't address those 80% and we are going to have to address those at some point.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to thank Bob and Mena for their work. I know they have been at this for awhile and I appreciate their efforts. My only question would be I didn't see any reference to at the major intersections large signs that indicate the name of the street. We have done it in some places – for

some reason Queen City and Elm rings a bell. If you are a visitor from out of town and you pull up you know if you are on Queen City and approaching Elm Street and vice versa. In many, many intersections in the downtown and in other districts we have small signs attached to a pole on the corner. Could that or should that be included as part of this?

Mr. MacKenzie responded you are correct. I know the first ones Traffic put up were at Queen City and Elm Street and at those big roadway intersections we need bigger signs. That is not really part of this package but over time the City is going to have to replace a lot of those smaller ones just because you can't see them.

Alderman O'Neil asked isn't that part of wayfinding. If I am giving directions to go to a hotel or to a restaurant it is not going to tell me look for signs like you had up on the slide. It is going to give me specifics especially if you use Mapquest or something like that. It is going to tell me take a left on Canal. The sooner I see where Canal is the better my travel is. I am just wondering should it be part of it?

Mr. MacKenzie answered they should all be integrated. It should be part of it. We haven't looked at it at this point because that is another effort that the Traffic Division is going to have to work on. I think the new signs they put up look good and work good. I think it is just a matter of them being able to have the time to replace them.

Alderman O'Neil asked when you report back on the pilot can you take a look at how many intersections, major intersections, would be affected. It is my recommendation that we include the larger signs at those intersections. I don't know Mr. Chairman if you can picture them but they are up on the mast arm. It stands out and you know exactly where you are at.

Mr. MacKenzie brought up a slide and stated there is the street sign...this is Salmon Street and Elm Street. It would seem to make sense that if we do the wayfinding at a particular intersection such as this one that we also update the street signs.

Alderman O'Neil asked am I correct Bob that they are up on the mast arm.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated you wouldn't know that says Elm Street.

Mr. MacKenzie responded not from here no.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just throw that out as a suggestion Mr. Chairman that we include that as part of it.

Alderman Roy stated Bob you mentioned if I heard you correctly that right now there were no City funds requested. In the future are any City funds going to be requested?

Mr. MacKenzie responded we don't have plans at this point. We will take care of a good chunk of the central part of the City. We are hoping to devise a system where these signs, many of them, can be done actually in-house in the Traffic Department. There will be some additional hardware for some of these things and some additional funds needed for let's say some of the map kiosks but I am hoping that once the pilot is done that the Board feels this is really valuable to the City and will tell the staff to find more money to do the rest of the City.

Alderman Roy asked and that number when you come back in after you have sold us on the pilot what are you looking for for a total.

Mr. MacKenzie answered right now I think we have \$83,000 and I am just guessing but we could potentially go out and do the rest of the City for probably an equal amount so on the order of \$85,000 or \$90,000.

Alderman Roy asked so it is very safe to say that the whole City could get done for \$100,000 of taxpayer funds.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I believe so.

Alderman Roy asked what do you feel this would add to the aesthetic beauty or tourism or economic development...whatever label you want to put on it. What value do you put on this as far as what we have been doing in the City?

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is hard to quantify but certainly this is one of those projects that is not a multi-million dollar project but it pays big dividends. People get a good impression when they go to cities and I have been to some cities recently that have great signage and it just gives you a whole new feel of what the city is like. It is not a backwards city, it is a progressive city. It is hard to tabulate what that is worth but it is very valuable to the City in terms of economic development, giving positive impressions...if a business comes to the City and stops at the Airport, which is great and they come downtown to go to the Verizon and there is good signage and there is a new Granite Street gateway that businessperson might say this is a great place. It is impressive, they have their act together and it is the type of place I might want to invest in. It is hard to quantify the benefits but it is certainly much greater than the initial cost.

Alderman Roy stated I have two final questions. The first one being have any other groups viewed this and bought into it like the Chamber of Commerce or MDC?

Mr. MacKenzie responded we have been working with a group or a couple of groups over the years at the Chamber of Commerce. We did have a presentation to some Chamber of Commerce people and got them packages in the last couple of weeks. They have been anxious to get this done. They see the value from a business standpoint in having this done in the City.

Alderman Roy stated in that same line I have one final follow-up. The walkable neighborhoods that came out of Intown Manchester, does this tie in and have they reviewed it?

Mr. MacKenzie responded Intown has not reviewed it. We have seen their walkable concept and ultimately we are going to have pedestrian signs downtown in this area and we are going to have to make them mesh. We are going to have to make sure that the walkable neighborhoods work with anything we put up.

Alderman Shea stated I just have a simple question. When I visit say Boston or other places it is the quality of the sign that I am more interested in to find my way around. In other words, signs may be very visible during the day when somebody comes into our City but when they are trying to leave the City unless the quality of that sign is discernable by them...I would hope that the signs themselves whether it be wording, place or so forth are so discernible that no one really has to stop their car and have somebody in back of them whack into them. Do you know what I am trying to indicate you Bob? It is very important when signs are put up we are not penny wise and pound foolish in terms of how the lettering or the quality of the signs is displayed. I think that is very important. Location has been hit upon and the financial aspects but I think that is important as well.

Alderman Forest stated I know I am not on the Committee but I was on a committee when this was first proposed almost four years ago and I think it is about time we start with it. A lot of the things you see there could be on one sign. I know that as an Alderman I have had requests from little leaguers and softball organizations...you know they are into the all-star season now and the ASA is running state tournaments and it is difficult for people coming in from out of town to find a ballpark so this would be good at intersections like Bremer Street to find the South Junior Deb or West Junior Deb fields and all of that. I think it is a good idea and I think it is about time we start working on it.

Alderman Long stated Bob I have a couple of questions. One is looking at the proposal that you sent us under process it says the system will be administered by the Traffic Department with consultation from the Planning and Community Development Department, Public Safety and Traffic Committee as may be required. Then it says the department shall be responsible for the determination of what destination will be identified. The department meaning the Planning and Community Development Department?

Mr. MacKenzie responded no that would be the Traffic Division.

Alderman Long asked so the Traffic Division will determine what signage will go up.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes based up on the guidelines that we put together. If there are questions about what the guidelines...you know whether some institution falls under the guidelines I think that is where you become the appeals board. I think it would be useful if we came back to you say once a year to review the criteria and who is on the qualified list. Again it is going to be hard for you because there are going to be people who really want to be on the sign but can't be because they are a full profit business and they want to do advertising. I think we believe that if you adopt the guidelines as part of this then the Traffic Division can really follow those in most cases and only come to you when there is an issue that comes up.

Alderman Long asked so if we are recommending to the full Board passage of this proposal and hypothetically if that is done then this Committee has no oversight unless there is a potential problem in which case they would come back to this Committee for a determination. Is that they way you are looking at it?

Mr. MacKenzie responded I think that is the way we were envisioning it. Obviously you can review any of these and have in the past but the reason we put the preliminary listing in there is I don't see this changing too often. I mean we have some major landmarks and we have a lot of them. It will probably be relatively rare where the Traffic Division decides there should be a new sign up. That is really why we put that preliminary listing in there. If you are comfortable with that, that listing is not going to change too much.

Alderman Long stated the acronym...the Traffic Department following the principles of the MUTCD. What does that stand for?

Mr. MacKenzie responded that is Manual and Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Those are standardized national guidelines for signage systems.

Chairman Osborne stated I would like to vote on this this evening and if it passes then it will go to the full Board for their decision but have it return back to the Traffic Committee for other studies. Does that sound good to you?

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked Bob didn't you recommend doing a pilot program.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. The pilot program would be in the central part of the City. We would not yet be going up to Mammoth Road or up Front Street. It would be pretty much from like Webster Street down to Queen City Avenue and part of the West Side.

Alderman O'Neil asked so theoretically you could put the program together and bring it back to the Committee for approval correct so that we get...I tell you I don't necessarily have a real comfort level with kind of leaving it open ended for the determination of signs because I know ultimately it ends up here. So if it is going to end up here I would rather have us involved early in the process and not later.

Mr. MacKenzie asked for the pilot area or beyond the pilot area.

Alderman O'Neil answered I think if we do the pilot area you bring it back with specific recommendations like at this intersection it is going to say A, B, C, D. I think once we get a feel for it and say yeah that makes sense...I do have a little bit as Alderman Long brought up the process of just saying go out and do it when I know if there are going to be issues it is going to end up back at our table. Is that a...I think that request is fair.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes. We are going to have to go out location by location and specify who goes where. If you would like to see that before it is finally done...

Alderman O'Neil interjected I would. I don't want to speak for the rest of the Committee but I would. Just one other point. I don't think you need a motion to bring it back before us do you?

Chairman Osborne stated I think we will put that in the motion. We will make the motion to go to the full Board and come back to us.

Alderman O'Neil stated just one other thing. Bob something I found in our current wayfinding signs is that there is some inconsistency in what a particular venue is called. I know there was some issue with the DOT and federal money and being

able to call the arena Verizon Wireless Arena right on our state highway sign. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes they have a little bit of an issue with that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess my concern and I am sure this wasn't intentional but just looking at one of the slides you put up again we show Singer Park and there is actually a request to change that tonight but in two examples one says civic arena which would be consistent with the state sign and then it says Verizon Civic Arena. I just think whatever we do let's be consistent because I think it is confusing to people when they are looking for a venue and depending on where you are it can have a different name on a sign. I just ask you to consider that. Can you comment on what we are restricted on by I guess state highways that have accepted federal money?

Mr. MacKenzie responded on state highways they are hesitant to use...obviously in some cities you have companies that own stadiums but they are hesitant to use anything that smacks of advertising. I think we are probably going to recommend that for the two venues that will probably be under the most discussion that we have baseball stadium as one standard name throughout the City and then we have arena and leave it as arena and people know what the arena is. I think in those two cases people will still be able to find their way but they don't really promote advertising.

Alderman Roy stated staying on that same vein, Bob, I take exception with the state more than your last answer but we do have two companies that are offsetting funds that the taxpayers could be footing so I don't think it smacks of advertisement and I am wondering how hard would we have to fight to actually use the name of the two stadiums for the arena on all signage. I think it is a good advertisement for the ball team and the arena and I think it is a good advertisement for the City that we have these venues. I am just asking how hard would it be to get through this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied having it on the highway system would be extremely difficult. The City could do it on their local signage so when you come up to Elm Street at this location the Committee could approve "This way to Verizon Wireless Arena" and "This way to Merchants Auto.com Stadium" but I think that you will have to make that decision as to once you have crossed a certain line how do you turn down other advertising of other businesses. That is a hard line for you to deal with and that is why we are recommending a conservative standpoint.

Alderman Roy responded I appreciate your taking a conservative standpoint but again like in my business there are no public funds being used to support it or

show its location and the public has a direct interest in the success of the Verizon and the success of the ballpark. I don't see a lot of difference between Singer Park, which was paid for by the Singer Family and Merchants Auto.com Stadium, which is also funded by the Singer Family. For me I would look to push as hard as this Committee and our Board of Aldermen can to get those two venues on the signage on the highway so that the people coming to Manchester know where they are going. One last question because I didn't see it in your slides, that intersection has a number of religious signs. Are those going to be included on the signage?

Mr. MacKenzie replied at this point we are recommending not primarily because we have so many religious institutions in the City that at major intersections such as this one once you allow one and another one sees this new signage package and comes in it is going to be difficult to deal with that. They are also more congregational related as opposed to visitor related. There are visitors that come to different churches I know but I think the sheer volume of churches in the City is going to make it difficult to regulate. What we have discussed is that it may be appropriate as you come within a block of a particular church you could have signage on the cross street that it is a block away but on major intersections like this, this intersection has probably two dozen churches within a few blocks and you simply couldn't have all of those on the sign and once you put one on this intersection how do you draw the line?

Alderman Roy responded that being said we have the same situation now where two of those signs have been allowed by this Committee or this Committee in past years and there is nothing from stopping those other 12 from coming forward and asking for an individual sign. I would like to see this either replace all signage so it cleans up the intersections and adds aesthetic value but looking at this intersection you have the first sign, which is regulatory, the second sign, which is religious, the third sign, which is hospital and the university and the fourth sign is religious and then you have a bus stop squeezed in and then you have the new museum signs that we just did during my tenure here and then we have a hidden sign for the Franco-American Center and another sign for the Palace. I would like to see all of that throughout the City incorporated into one signage package. It may get to be a very large sign but at least it is one. If we had that same signage with regulatory and then our City package and then the churches that we allowed or religious institutions we allowed you are back to the same three or four signs instead of one neat sign. Although I am very supportive of this I would like it to be all encompassing and I would also encourage that it does come back to this Committee possibly with a rendition of what that would look like and a digital photo of the intersection as it looks now with photography as inexpensive as it is now. It would be a great way for us to make up our minds.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the wayfinding signage package and refer it to the full Board for approval with staff to report back on the specific signage/locations for the pilot program when it is ready. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Traffic Signal Agreement between the City of Manchester and Town of Bedford regarding improvement, timing and maintenance of South River Road traffic signals at Second Street and South Main Street in Manchester and at Colby Court and Bedford Square in Bedford.

Alderman Roy stated my question is for the Solicitor's Office. The City reviewed this and are they comfortable with signing this document?

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, responded I am not sure if our office has reviewed it.

Jim Hoben, Traffic Director, stated I sent it to Tom Clark and he was okay with it.

Chairman Osborne asked there are no monies from the City with this right.

Mr. Hoben answered none whatsoever. It is the Town of Bedford.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the agreement. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Long stated I have a couple of questions. Page 2 regarding the improvement of traffic signal, I am under the impression that the company that is building the Exxon Mobile is responsible for putting the initial lights in. Is that correct?

Jason Plourde, Greenman-Pederson, Inc. responded that is correct.

Alderman Long asked after completion of the work Bedford monitors it and the City of Manchester owns it, repairs it and maintains it.

Mr. Plourde answered that is correct. The maintenance of the actual traffic signal heads are under the responsibility of maintenance of the City. The actual coordination system would be maintained by the Town of Bedford.

Alderman Long stated my concern is from Back River Road south to Bedford I can see the traffic flowing good there but let's say for example that South Main Street and Second Street get backed up. Reading through this contract there is no guarantee that we could get that fixed or address that problem because Bedford has control over the...

Mr. Hoben interjected we could always back that on. We could change the coordination.

Alderman Long stated according to this Bedford has control of that.

Mr. Hoben responded we could force them off and go back to coordinating it ourselves.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Bridge Street Signal Warrant Analyses-Findings submitted by Southern NH Planning Commission.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Duval told me we could receive and file this because there are some other efforts going on to try to improve the situation.

Alderman Roy stated in reading the letter it seems like the lights are not warranted so I would move to receive and file.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated before we vote on that I think and Mr. White and Mr. Hoben or Lt. Valenti could comment but there are some ongoing discussions about...I am sure speed is one of them and that would be the Police Department's responsibility but am I correct Lieutenant that there are other discussions going on.

Lt. Valenti responded yes I have been in conversation with Alderman Duval and we have been trying to address the speed problem on that street and directing officers out to that area to run radar and try to slow down the traffic.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a question for Mr. White. Tim did you...you have done these all over the region did you see any specific other things we could be doing that maybe we haven't done to improve the intersection at all?

Tim White, Senior Transportation Planner, Southern NH Planning Commission, responded the impression from reading the project correspondence is the main issue out there seemed to be the speed.

Alderman O'Neil asked so if we address the speed that should improve the situation.

Mr. White answered yes that appears to be the principal issue.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Middle Street and Market Street Parking Plan submitted by the Department of Highways.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to make a comment. Did the Highway Department and the consultant talk at all when he was here? He had pretty strong feelings about this and this completely contradicts what he said and I believe Mr. Lutz is an engineer.

Chairman Osborne replied let's let Bruce discuss this a little bit and see what he has to say.

Bruce Thomas, Highway Department, stated I did take a look at it.

Alderman O'Neil asked did you or anyone at the Highway Department talk to the consultant when he was here.

Mr. Thomas answered no. I do have the...when we originally addressed Mechanic Street I had a copy of the report and it had the sketch of Mechanic Street in it.

Alderman O'Neil responded that is the curve ball in this whole thing. He recommended Mechanic originally and we threw in other streets am I correct?

Mr. Thomas replied that is right. He recommended Mechanic and I did an estimate on that, which came out to \$1 million. Since then by the way I have revised that estimate to \$600,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated I need to apologize to Bruce because it wasn't apples to apples.

Mr. Thomas stated what I have done is as you can see I have taken the City's hundred scale plans and overlaid 45 degree parking and 25 degree parking spaces on top of the existing spaces just to give you an idea of what type of spaces you could get. By doing that you can see on those plans that the lane width for travel is not really wide enough to pass through. Typically it is about 13' or so for Middle Street and about 9' or so for 45 degree parking for Market Street. It may even narrow up a little bit as you get toward Canal Street. If you take a look at the plans I think you can see that. Now Mechanic Street, based on what the consultant said, that final lane width would be about 14.9' so you could probably squeeze those angled parking spaces in there. I point out there that in conversations we have had and meetings we have had to discuss this parking study that the Fire Department requested something like 22'. One thing I haven't really spelled out here is when I mention the gain in parking spaces, for instance Mechanic Street I figured about 22 spaces gained for 45-degree parking. That does not include any bump out so the sketch that you saw in the parking report showed several bump outs. This is just one section...I know you have all seen this. This one section shows five different bump outs. If you have 22 new spaces without any bump outs and you figure two spaces for each bump out then you are already down to like 12 spaces. Of course you can configure things...maybe you can make it a little more than that. Assuming we go with the 22 spaces and the estimate to fix up Mechanic Street and I am using that one because it seems to be the only feasible one, the estimate is \$600,000 and you would get 22 spaces. That is about \$27,000 a space. Part of the \$600,000 estimate is to remove the concrete sidewalk on Mechanic Street and make it a brick sidewalk because I think it is the plan of the Planning Department to have all of the sidewalks downtown similar. If you don't do the sidewalk that would significantly decrease the amount of money for the renovation. You would still have to put in bump outs and all of that. Another benefit on Mechanic Street is that there is lighting on both sides of the street and some of it at least on the North Side of the street is not Amoskeag lighting so I have included a cost to replace the lighting with Amoskeag lighting. Anyway there are a whole bunch of options but to bring it all up to brick sidewalks with bump outs it would cost about \$600,000. To just add bump outs on the other two streets it would be about \$200,000.

Chairman Osborne asked did Mr. Lutz look at different areas besides Mechanic Street. We seem to be on Mechanic Street all of the time whereas Hanover Street already has brick sidewalks don't they?

Mr. Thomas asked was he the consultant for the downtown study.

Alderman O'Neil answered he was the parking consultant.

Mr. Thomas responded I don't know. I know he mentioned Mechanic.

Chairman Osborne stated well whereas we already have brick sidewalks couldn't we do it there instead of tearing up all of this concrete and spending a lot more money for a pilot program.

Mr. Thomas responded I don't know if he looked into the other streets.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a comment. We shouldn't be making a decision on parking based on brick sidewalks. I am of the opinion that we should stop installing brick sidewalks because they are a maintenance and liability issue. I was on Elm Street meeting somebody for coffee and I must have saw half a dozen places where the bricks had lifted out and the City is liable for that if somebody falls and gets hurt. There are maintenance problems. They look great for about the month that they last and then you get some snow and plowing and...I hope we are not making decisions based on brick sidewalks. I think we should move away from brick sidewalks.

Chairman Osborne responded I think so too. I am just saying if they are going to do this why don't we go where the brick sidewalks are already. I mean \$600,000 to tear up the concrete? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Thomas replied that would be part of the cost yes.

Alderman Long asked do we know currently what the lane width is on Market and Middle Street.

Mr. Thomas answered yes we do but I don't have a scale to measure it off of my plan. I am sure it is about 25'.

Alderman Long asked so it would draw down the lane width substantially if we did this.

Mr. Thomas answered you can visually see it in these plans.

Alderman Long stated also Mechanic Street, that proposal is a one-way correct.

Mr. Thomas responded yes and I don't know if I made it clear but you don't have to do bump outs or anything. You can just change the striping for virtually no cost or just the cost of the paint and the labor to do that.

Alderman Long stated I have to concur with Alderman O'Neil with respect to the bricks. They high pressure wash them and the mortar comes out and people are tripping. It is a maintenance nightmare.

Alderman Shea stated in terms of your discussion with us, it is not feasible to do this so I would make a motion to receive and file.

Alderman Roy stated on the surface I would agree with Alderman Shea but this question may and hopefully will change the general opinion. Bruce, the width of the sidewalks on Market and Middle Street right now there is basically a 6' difference between the width of Mechanic Street, which you are saying is feasible and the width of Market Street, which is the thinnest. I am wondering if there is 6' to be gained there or enough so you are satisfied with the final lane width? We are looking at a parking issue in this area and we are either looking at building a parking garage or doing something with on-street parking. Personally I would prefer to do on-street parking without brick, which seems to be the least expensive way. I do concur with Alderman O'Neil and Alderman Long that brick is aesthetically pleasing but it is a maintenance nightmare. So what are our alternatives? I like the additional spaces that you can create but what I am really looking for is, and unfortunately on your design it was backwards of what I was thinking of being able to come up Market Street towards City Hall and pull into angled parking going uphill and then if you needed to go around the block take a right on Franklin and a right on Middle going down to Canal and that would make a nice loop because you can only go one direction on Canal. With what you are drawing if you got to the end of Market Street you would have to take a right and then find another way back towards Middle Street. I was looking at it in reverse but either way the counts don't change. Is there 6' we can pick up on the thinnest street, which is Market to give you that 15' width?

Mr. Thomas replied I don't think we could do that. I think the right-of-way on Market Street and Middle Street is a little bit less than Mechanic Street and I believe even though...if you look at the lane width of Middle and Mechanic I think both of those are both the same, the right-of-way width but I think on Market Street the sidewalks are slightly wider than Middle Street and that is why there is a difference there. When you drive down those streets you can see the trees and things like that that really need a big width for the sidewalks. I think you are really limited in what you have out there.

Alderman Roy responded I just...we need to find a solution to the problem in that area and whether it is doing Mechanic by itself without the sidewalk package and making it a striping and a signage and making it one-way and increasing by 22 parking spaces I think we should definitely at least move that forward or let you study it and come back to us with a price. Twenty-two spaces is very coveted in

that area and I think we should look at all options and even if it does reduce the width of a sidewalk...on Middle Street we are talking about 1' or 10" so I think we could gain a foot on either side of this roadway and still keep a nice sidewalk and create 14 new parking spaces at low cost.

Randy Sherman, Deputy Finance Officer, stated just quickly on Mechanic Street the reason that the parking consultant looked at Mechanic Street was two issues. One, Mechanic is actually and Bruce will probably tell me it is a couple of inches difference but Mechanic Street is the same width as Stark Street, which is one of the streets that is one way and we now have angled parking on the sides. It was all redone when Mr. Jabjiniak was here. All of those sidewalks were done with the bump outs. I am not sure quite how many parking spaces we did pick up but we do have the angled parking down there and that is why they looked at Mechanic Street. The second reason they looked at Mechanic Street is they observed that with the Y and you have drop-offs and pick-ups and people coming and going there quite frequently, they observed a number of what they consider safety issues. Kids running across the street and people making U-turns to get into parking spots and they thought it was pretty wise to turn that into a one-way street anyway. More for safety and if you could pick up additional parking spaces. I know on the drawing they have Mechanic Street going east to west. I think after further discussion with them and when they were back in front of the Committee in April I think Mr. Lutz reversed that and thought that it should go West to East again so the drop-off of the children would actually be from cars coming in the correct direction and again they wouldn't have to be crossing the street. They did only look at that one street, again mainly because the City had already done it on Stark and it seemed to make sense and when you have a one-way street going one way that the next one would be one-way going in the opposite direction. Again, part of the amount of money that Bruce is talking about is to redo the sidewalks, which I think you probably would agree some of those sidewalks need redoing anyway. I am not sure that that is a fair estimation in coming up with a price per space when you throw in the sidewalk if it actually does need to be done.

Alderman O'Neil moved to receive and file. I want to apologize to Bruce. I kind of jumped on him quick. The consultant never recommended Middle or Market. We are the ones who threw those two streets in there so I apologize to you Bruce for that.

Alderman Roy asked Bruce how long would it take you to measure the widths now that we know how you laid out with the 19.1 and the 45 degree angle how long would it take you to get a width of Pleasant, West Merrimack, Market Street south, Stark, Mechanic Street and I believe Spring Street to the north. Is that something fairly simple?

Mr. Thomas answered it would take maybe 20 minutes.

Alderman Roy asked if you could come back to us because I do think we need to take everything in those blocks very seriously and look at the changes and I would urge this Committee before we receive and file something to at least go forward with the Mechanic Street changes with the paint and signage, which would create 22 spots.

Chairman Osborne stated when he is ready he can come back. We are receiving and filing. We had a motion and a second. You can oppose it.

Alderman Roy replied well it is something we have been talking about for months and if we are going to take...

Chairman Osborne interjected well he can bring it back.

Alderman Roy responded but Mechanic Street is already here. That is what I am trying to say.

Chairman Osborne stated it has been here for many years.

Alderman Roy replied right and if we are looking at creating 22 parking spaces for very little money we should go ahead and at least do the signage and paint...

Chairman Osborne interjected do you want to withdraw your motion Alderman Shea.

Alderman O'Neil stated the discussion on Item 6 is Middle and Market Street, not Mechanic Street. We are not killing anything.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Ordinance amendment submitted by Alderman Thibault.

“Amending Section 70.55 Residential Permit Parking, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding a Residential Parking Permit Zone #7.”

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Hoben can you enlighten us a little bit on this one.

Mr. Hoben answered actually I think this one comes under Police.

Chairman Osborne stated well whatever you have to put the signs there.

Lt. Valenti stated Alderman Thibault has been in contact with Dale Robinson over at Ordinance Violations and did request residential parking on Joliette Street between Kelley and Bremer and the reason for that obviously is that the residents there feel like they are being squeezed by the time zone on that street, which is prohibiting them from parking on the street without being ticketed. That is why he is bringing this forward.

Alderman Forest stated I know I called a few of you in the last couple of days. The ordinance that Alderman Thibault recommended was due to I believe a ward meeting he had Wednesday night and there was one person there that was complaining about not being able to park in front of his house. The two time zones that are on that street, there is one two hour zone, which I think is for two cars in front of the Good Look Nook beauty parlor there and then there is another time zone across the street, which I believe has three or maybe four cars. That is a one-hour zone. The rest of the street is unlimited parking. There are no limits or time zones or anything else. In this particular ordinance I believe and I have been trying to get a hold of Alderman Thibault and have not been able to but I think personally this would open a can of worms for not only the West Side but there are other residents in the City that have been asking for residential parking all over the City. I know when I was on the Traffic Committee this Committee denied a lot of these people already and I think we would be opening it up by making this a residential parking zone. There is unlimited parking but unfortunately for this one particular resident the area across the street happens to be zoned commercial and industrial and there is a business there. There are people who come into work every morning and they take up the free spaces. I believe the gentleman who complained does have a couple of parking spots in the back alley and I don't think you should approve this ordinance. I believe it should be killed.

Alderman Shea moved to receive and file. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from James Osborne expressing his concerns regarding the safety at the intersection of Belmont and Spruce Streets.

Chairman Osborne stated I wanted to tell the Committee that I have already taken care of the situation there. I added some "Wrong Way" signs there that they can't

miss and there were some “One Way” signs that were down from the construction in that area. I think the way it is situated right now it is going to be fine and I would like to have a motion to receive and file.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to receive and file.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication submitted by residents of Karatzas Avenue relative to the removal of “No Parking” signs in the area.

Mr. Hoben stated I met with one of the residents with Alderman Pinard and their concern was they had the signs removed. With the condition of the road we really shouldn't take them away. As a matter of fact, the no parking section at the end of the road, Alderman Pinard wanted to place on the next agenda to cover the rest.

Alderman Roy stated just so we are perfectly clear, there has been no request to take them down and if anything we are increasing the number of no parking signs.

Mr. Hoben responded we are going to retain the ones that are there.

Alderman Roy asked but there has been no request for the no parking signs to come down. If we receive and file this...

Mr. Hoben interjected there has been a verbal request.

Alderman Roy asked so there has been no formal request and Alderman Pinard hasn't made a formal request to you or put anything in writing to take these signs down.

Mr. Hoben answered right.

Alderman Roy asked so if we receive and file this the signs stay and someone has to put in writing that they want the signs removed and we have to act on it at that time.

Alderman Roy moved to receive and file. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked who made the verbal request to remove them.

Mr. Hoben stated I believe it was Saggy Tahir.

Alderman Shea asked is that because of the new mosque.

Mr. Hoben answered right. They are going to build a new mosque and I believe they are worried that they won't have enough parking in the lot.

Alderman Shea stated they should have a larger parking area then. That is my opinion.

Alderman O'Neil asked isn't that part of the site plan approval. If they don't have enough parking they shouldn't be getting a building permit.

Mr. Hoben answered that is what the residents were saying also.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote on the motion to receive and file. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Discussion relative to Saturday parking fees.

Alderman O'Neil moved to receive and file. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked isn't that part of the budget.

Chairman Osborne answered yes it is part of the \$300,000.

Alderman Shea stated so basically what we are saying is we will have to come up with \$300,000 more for revenue.

Alderman Roy stated I think we should have this discussion once we have a parking manager in place.

Alderman Shea asked should we keep it on the table.

Alderman O'Neil stated my guess is when the Parking Manager comes on board this is going to be an issue again so instead of leaving it on the table how about we just receive and file.

Alderman Shea responded I am in favor of tabling it instead of receiving and filing.

Chairman Osborne stated well Alderman O'Neil made the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated I voted against including the \$300,000 in the parking revenue.

Alderman Long stated I would like to move to table this. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked so you want to table this Alderman Long.

Alderman Long responded yes I think there is room for discussion. I would rather table it.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote on the motion to receive and file. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Discussion relative to parking meter bag listing as of 12:30 PM on Monday, June 12, 2006 (subject to change daily):

1998	<u>Verizon</u> (originally Bell Atlantic) – 3 meter bags #11,13 & 14
02/08/2006	<u>North End Properties</u> – Bernard Gasser – 1 meter bag #2005 Customer was billed in the amount of \$1,020 and has paid \$1,020. Denise spoke with Mr. Gasser and his intention is to use the bag for a short time longer – claims he is doing rehab work in the JW Hills building and does not want the bag any longer that he has to.
03/02/2006	<u>RHouse</u> – Nick Michaud – 1 meter bag #CD
04/13/2006	<u>DemCon</u> – Jason Ferrell – 2 meter bags #77 & 9 – still in use
05/10/2006	<u>Calypso Communications</u> – Pat Hynes – 5 meter bags #F6, 10002, 15, 1234 & 2004 – still in use
05/24/2006	<u>TRB Development</u> – Jim Buchanan – 1 meter bag #10001 – still in use
06/12/2006	<u>DB Perry</u> – David Perry – 1 meter bag #C, still in use

Chairman Osborne asked what has become of this. When we mentioned this at the last meeting I think we discussed meter bags.

Mr. Hoben answered that is the current listing that you have in front of you. Those are the bags that are out.

Alderman O'Neil asked so there are only 13 bags out.

Mr. Hoben answered it varies day to day.

Alderman O'Neil stated the Verizon has been doing it so when they have to send trucks down to do repairs to the businesses and I have no problem with that. I am just not convinced that all of these others are being used for the purpose of the bags. I drove by the one on Merrimack Street again. I don't see any construction activity going on in that building. I think we need to either come up with a higher fee or stricter requirements on the use of these bags. Even though it is limited, I think they are being abused to be honest with you.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Hoben do you have any ideas on that.

Mr. Hoben stated Denise spoke to the one on Merrimack Street. He said he is still doing construction in the building – the owner.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to publicly thank Denise for following up on that specifically but I am looking at some of these others – five meter bags for Calypso Communications...not to debate this thing tonight but I think we need to take a look at this whole meter bag situation.

Chairman Osborne asked do they show building permits when they come to obtain these bags.

Mr. Hoben answered no they don't.

Chairman Osborne asked why not.

Mr. Hoben answered the way the policy is written that was never required.

Chairman Osborne stated maybe we ought to change that.

Alderman O'Neil responded except that Verizon won't be getting a building permit when they get a call to repair something. I think how Verizon uses it is exactly the intent of it. Businesses coming down to service other businesses in the downtown area. That is the intent of this, not to create all day parking for people.

Alderman O'Neil moved to receive and file. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy asked what is the cost per bag per day.

Mr. Hoben answered it is \$15/day.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne advised that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:

STOP SIGNS:

On Proctor Road at Hanover Street, NEC
On Foch Street at Hanover Street, NWC
On Alladin Street at Congressional Lane, NWC
Alderman Pinard

On Jobin Drive at Miami Court, SWC/NEC (3-way stop) (Emergency Act)
On Miami Court at Jobin Drive, SWC (3-way stop) (Emergency Act)
Alderman DeVries

NO PARKING (9AM – 5PM/Monday-Friday):

On Ash Street, west side, from Orange Street to Prospect Street
Alderman Gatsas

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Ash Street, east side, from Myrtle Street to a point 100 feet north
On Oakhill Avenue, west side, from Reservoir Avenue to a point 500 feet north of
Tower Hill Road
On Oakhill Avenue, both sides, from Reservoir Avenue to Tower Hill Road
Alderman Gatsas

On Oakland Avenue, north side, from Woodbine Avenue to a point 50 feet east
(Emergency Act)
On Oakland Avenue, north side, from Woodbine Avenue to a point 45 feet west
(Emergency Act)
Alderman Osborne

On Pond Drive, west side, from a point 365 feet south of Goffs Falls Road to a
point 65 feet southerly (Emergency Act)
On Pond Drive, south side, from a point 225 feet west of Kennedy Avenue to a
point 85 feet west
Alderman DeVries

NO PARKING DURING SCHOOL HOURS:

On South Gray Court, east side, from Fernand Street to a point 84 feet south
(Emergency Act)

On South Gray Court, east side, from a point 196 feet south of Fernand Street to the dead end southerly (Emergency Act)
Alderman DeVries

RESCIND 2-HOUR PARKING:

On Brook Street, north side, from Elm Street East Street to Chestnut Street
(ORD. 2714)

On Temple Court, east side, from Harrison Street to a point 100 feet south of Brook Street (ORD. 8848)

Alderman Long

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLES PROHIBITED:

On Dearborn Street from a point 310 feet north of Grove Street to Summer Street
Alderman Osborne

On Pine Island Road, from Brown Avenue to Whitwell Street
On Greenleaf Street, from Brown Avenue to Whitwell Street
Alderman DeVries

**RESCIND COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC PROHIBITED
(9:30 PM – 7AM):**

On Dearborn Street from a point 345 feet north of Grove Street to Summer Street
(ORD. 6659 – EMERGENCY ACT)

Alderman Osborne

RESCIND YIELD SIGN:

On Proctor Road at Hanover Street, NEC
Alderman Pinard

CROSSWALK:

Across South Main Street, south of Hale Street
Alderman Smith

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we have an addition to the traffic agenda. It is Commercial Vehicle Traffic Prohibited on Pine Island Road, from Brown Avenue to Whitwell Street and on Greenleaf Street, from Brown Avenue to Whitwell Street as submitted by Alderman DeVries.

Alderman O'Neil asked could the Lieutenant enlighten me as to where...Pine Island Road.

Deputy Clerk Normand answered that is what this says.

Alderman O'Neil stated I hate to put you on the spot but do you happen to know off the top of your head where it is.

Mr. Hoben responded it is the first street south of Winston Street.

Alderman O'Neil stated Winston is where the Wastewater Treatment Plant is.

Mr. Hoben stated it is the last street where the ballpark is.

Alderman O'Neil asked they don't want commercial traffic on that.

Mr. Hoben stated the problem as Alderman DeVries was saying is that UPS cuts through those side streets to get back on Brown Avenue.

Alderman O'Neil asked isn't it a one-way back out to Brown Avenue from UPS. I was just there.

Mr. Hoben answered this is when they are coming back in.

Alderman O'Neil asked if you restrict them how do they get back in. Winston Street is the only way to get back in?

Mr. Hoben answered they could use Raymond or the other one.

Alderman O'Neil stated there are only three streets down there. I don't know how else they can get back in. I don't know if Officer Jeff Kelly in the back can enlighten us on this. Is there another street south of the ballpark?

Mr. Hoben responded that is the street they are going through. Greenleaf Street and after that it is Pine Island Road.

Alderman O'Neil asked so they still would be able to use the street along the baseball park.

Mr. Hoben answered right.

Lt. Valenti stated that is Tessier Street right there. What they are doing is coming in behind where the firing range is and coming across there.

Alderman O'Neil replied I didn't realize there was another street in there.

Lt. Valenti stated it is residential in through there.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to approve the traffic agenda as submitted with the additions.

Alderman Long asked with respect to the crosswalk is the City doing this crosswalk. Is that what this proposal is? It is the South Main Street, Hale Street, the Exxon Mobile and I believe in their plan they were going to construct that.

Mr. Hoben answered they will be doing that. This is just for the regulation.

NEW BUSINESS

A communication from the NH Fisher Cats requesting a change in the signage throughout Manchester due to the new name of the stadium.

Alderman Shea stated we just had a signage discussion this evening. This is kind of a temporary change so that people give recognition to the Singer family but I am not sure exactly whether all of the different signs that indicate the Singer Family should be replaced. Maybe they should.

Alderman O'Neil asked Jim aren't there signs up now. What do they say, Fisher Cat Ballpark?

Mr. Hoben answered on 293 the state put up a sign saying minor league baseball park. I had a discussion with the state yesterday. In town we have signs that say "Fisher Cats Baseball Stadium."

Alderman O'Neil stated so what they are asking is the 38 signs in the City be changed to Merchantsauto.com Stadium, Fisher Cats Baseball. I guess that is what they are asking for.

Chairman Osborne asked Jim did you get any information from the City Solicitor.

Mr. Hoben answered no.

Chairman Osborne asked Tom what is your opinion on this.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded I was just looking at it. It is basically the City's or the Committee's decision. You could do it either way. As is noted, that is not the sign on the highway. Earlier tonight we had some discussion about those signs and it appears that a number of them are going to be redone anyway.

Alderman O'Neil moved to refer this to the Wayfinding Program.

Chairman Osborne stated what I am getting at is why should we make changes now when we are going to have all of these big changes that we were talking about earlier number one and number two we were talking about making it only non-profit and City buildings for direction. Here we are talking about Merchantsauto.com, which is a business. It was fine saying Singer Park. It was a nice name I thought. Singer Family Park or anything like that but using a business name I am sure there are others out there that would love to do that also. I think we should receive and file this.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is no different than the Verizon Wireless Arena discussion we had earlier that we asked Mr. MacKenzie to work on.

Chairman Osborne replied that is true. There are two places. The Verizon and this ballpark.

Alderman O'Neil stated we own both of them.

Chairman Osborne responded that is fine but we should watch out as to who we are advertising as a City.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't disagree but earlier we asked Mr. MacKenzie to come back with a recommendation on this very issue. I am suggesting we just forward this communication to Mr. MacKenzie.

Chairman Osborne replied that is fine.

Alderman Shea stated I was going to suggest that we just forward this to Mr. MacKenzie without making a decision on it this evening.

Alderman O'Neil moved to refer the communication to the Planning Department. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy stated we all know that the wheels of City Hall and what we put forward tend to move very slowly. If there is no cost to the City then I would recommend that we do allow them to do this on their own nickel and then when the Wayfinding Pilot Program is done then that is incorporated into this. They have a name of a stadium and they are advertising it and we are trying to get people to it quickly and easily without traffic congestion and having ballpark signs up in some places and Fisher Cat Ballpark signs up in others, as Mr. MacKenzie mentioned it is just as confusing as having Verizon on one sign and civic arena on another. The cost originally Jim...what did the City pay to have the original signs done?

Mr. Hoben responded probably \$5,000.

Alderman Roy stated for the low cost of this I would like to see this moved just because the wayfinding sign pilot program is months if not many months away. If we could for the small amount of money help a business that we own that is paying us lease dollars and is partially funded by the company that...

Chairman Osborne interjected Mr. Roy I think 9/10 of the people out there now know where that ballpark is. Another thing is we have to start somewhere here. We just can't going with businesses like Verizon and Merchants Motors or Dobles Chevrolet or whatever it might be. We are getting back into something we are trying to get out of is what I am trying to say. I have nothing against the idea but...

Alderman Roy interjected there are two locations that the City has financial interest in and their success is crucial to the City and we should be doing everything we can to get people there.

Chairman Osborne stated all they want to know is where the ballpark is. That is my opinion.

Alderman Shea stated I don't disagree with what Alderman Roy is saying. I think though that that decision should come back to us by way of Bob MacKenzie. If Bob feels that it is appropriate then he should have something ready for the next meeting that we have, which would probably be in a month or so.

Chairman Osborne stated I think he said he didn't want to put business names on the signs. He made that pretty clear.

Alderman Shea stated well he can communicate with Mr. Smith and then get back to us and figure out who is in charge of signage.

Chairman Osborne responded again we have the last word.

Alderman Shea stated well he can bring it back and we can vote on it without necessarily saying at this time whether we should or should not do it. We can just give it to Bob MacKenzie. He is in charge of it. Let him come back to us and say I think it is a good idea for the signs to be changed or it is probably not a good idea at this stage because of the ongoing committee studying signage in the City.

Chairman Osborne called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Roy being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Osborne stated I would like to bring something in seeing I am not on the Administration Committee anymore. I don't want to open a can of worms here but I am a little confused with the Traffic Department situation where nobody knows where they are going. Can you enlighten me a little bit, Alderman O'Neil?

Alderman O'Neil replied I believe what the full Board passed at our last meeting as part of the budget was that the Traffic Department becomes a full operating division of the Highway Department like the Facilities Maintenance group.

Chairman Osborne responded as far as the bodies where are they going.

Alderman O'Neil asked what do you mean going.

Chairman Osborne asked is Traffic coming down to the Economic Development Office. Where are they going?

Alderman O'Neil stated the Traffic Division is going to stay where they are. The Parking Enterprise, which includes Denise moving, I know Mr. Borek said he was considering whether it made sense for Denise to come down to work in the Economic Development Office or someplace else in City Hall or to have her stay at the Traffic Division. I don't know if he has reached a conclusion on that yet.

Chairman Osborne called Mr. Borek forward. Do you know what is going on with Denise?

Paul Borek, Economic Development Director, stated yes.

Chairman Osborne asked what can she do outside of what she is doing now at your office.

Mr. Borek answered as I may have mentioned at the full Board meeting and further delineated afterwards in discussions with Denise I believe that Denise and the parking technicians should stay where they are until the conclusion of the parking permit renewal period, which is July 1. The customers know where they are and they come in and physically pick up the passes for the coming year so in the near term everyone stays where they are at and we will be handling payroll and review of purchasing and contracts and such.

Chairman Osborne asked do you feel in the long run it is better to leave them right where they are permanently whereas parking and everything else for people to come down and pay for everything down here at this building is hard. They are so

used to going up to the other building on Lincoln and Hayward. Which is better for the people?

Mr. Borek answered I believe ultimately the parking operation should be somewhere downtown where it is convenient for the public and convenient for the staff. With all of the parking operations and collections and all of the parking customers being downtown, it doesn't make a lot of sense to go back and forth to Hayward Street ultimately with the design set-up of an efficient system. The collections operations can be close at hand and the Parking Manager and the parking staff can be in the midst of the downtown and Millyard parking situation and be very close and very reachable to their customers and walk out and look at situations on a regular basis. I think ultimately the parking operation should be downtown or in the Millyard.

Alderman Long asked the Parking Manager, what is the estimated time of hiring a person.

Mr. Borek answered probably two months. We are advertising the position now and hope to begin interviews shortly.

Alderman Long asked so by September 1.

Mr. Borek answered I would hope so yes.

Chairman Osborne stated Mr. Hoben you have been there for quite a few years. What is your picture of this?

Mr. Hoben stated well going through this transition and working with Paul and the Highway Department...we had another meeting with Kevin Sheppard and Don Pinard on Monday and their contention was that there is more to it than they thought there was. That is one of the reasons for keeping Denise around until we figure out all of these different financial concerns.

Chairman Osborne stated well I just brought this up because the Public Safety and Traffic Committee will be into it once it gets going. I would like to have a little insight into the whole situation.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am surprised at that comment because publicly here at meetings Mr. Thomas said there were no issues. In phone conversations I have had with both Mr. Thomas before he left for vacation and Mr. Sheppard there were no issues so I am surprised all of the sudden that there are issues. That is the first I have heard of that.

Mr. Hoben stated we met Monday and Don Pinard was looking at it and trying to figure out how we were going to set-up payroll and the organizations and split them out.

Alderman O'Neil responded Highway has been through this. This isn't the first time they have done this. When we merged Public Building Services as the Facilities Division there were the same issues. It is actually a bigger organization than Traffic is so I am surprised that there are issues. There is going to be a transition phase but in discussions with Mr. Sheppard and with Mr. Thomas from the administrative side of it there were no issues so I am surprised to hear that there are issues now.

Mr. Hoben replied it is issues that they want to work out and feel that Denise should be there for a longer period of time.

Alderman O'Neil responded that is something that Mr. Thomas and Mr. Borek have to work out then.

Alderman Long asked are there any other issues besides the internal details of getting it set-up. Are there any issues that may take the focus off of the intended division?

Mr. Hoben answered no. I am just talking about setting it up so that it runs properly.

Alderman Long stated so it is going to be the same as it is now for the time being until we get a Parking Manager and then he or she will decide what direction to go in.

Mr. Hoben responded right.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we get and I will give them some leeway but on items 13 and 14 can we get a report back. Both of these go back to March and we still don't have a report.

Chairman Osborne asked do you want to take them off the table.

Alderman O'Neil answered no I don't. I just want to give the departments...I don't know if you are going to try to meet in July. I am guessing maybe in August but maybe by August or September they can get back to us with some information on this.

Lt. Valenti stated as far as Item 13 goes, I did have a conversation with Deputy Simmons. I didn't do a follow-up report to the Committee and I do apologize for that. In conversation with Deputy Simmons on this issue his stance was that it is a contractual item and that the details are voluntary. He didn't think by raising the rate we would have more officers taking the detail.

Alderman O'Neil asked he did not.

Lt. Valenti answered correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated with all due respect I have an issue and this goes back several weeks...

Deputy Clerk Normand asked do you want to move to take this off the table.

TABLED ITEMS

13. Discussion relating to police details as it relates to construction and/or nightclub details as requested by Alderman O'Neil.
(Tabled 03/21/2006 pending report from Police Department.)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman O'Neil stated when I pick up the paper and see there was an incident at Omega and this might go back a month now and one of the things that was clear in the paper was they couldn't fill the detail. In the meantime a bouncer if I read the paper correctly...there was an altercation with no police officer there. I think this is a serious matter and with all due respect I have had this discussion and I apologize that I am getting Lt. Valenti in the middle of this but I have had the discussion with Deputy Simmons and I disagree that it is a contractual issue. I think we set the fee here and if we determine that the clubs get a higher rate, then they should get a higher rate. I think they are very important details to fill and the reason you want a police officer there is to hopefully prevent an incident from occurring and if there is an incident that it is acted on quickly and not drawing units from all over the City because it has escalated. Instead of having Lt. Valenti in the middle of this maybe Deputy Simmons needs to appear before us the next time.

Alderman Shea moved to have Deputy Simmons attend the next meeting to discuss this issue.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to put the item back on the table.

14. Discussion relating to coordination of services and utilities during storm events such as what occurred on February 10, 2006 as requested by Alderman O'Neil.
(Tabled 03/21/2006 pending report from Fire and Police Departments.)

This item remained on the table.

15. Parking Study Recommendations
(Tabled 04/18/2006 – previously forwarded under separate cover.)

This item remained on the table.

16. **STOP SIGNS:**
On Lacourse Street at Rhode Island Avenue, NEC
On New York Street at Rhode Island Avenue, SWC
Alderman Duval
(Tabled 05/16/2006)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Long it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

s/Leo R. Bernier
Clerk of Committee